

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of August 19, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended, is respectfully requested.

Status of the Application:

Previously pending claims 9-16, with claims 9 and 16 being independent, remain pending in this application, and new claim 17 has been added. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action of August 19, 2008, claims 9-15 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph; claims 9-15 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as nonstatutory subject matter; and claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by WO 02/01822 ("Lantto"). Applicants, having carefully considered the Examiner's rejections, together with the comments provided in support thereof, respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that the invention as claimed recites statutory subject matter and that the claims are patentably distinct over the applied reference.

Amendments:

Claims 9-16 have been amended to improve the form thereof. New claim 17 has been added. New claim 17 recites a terminal adapted for simultaneous connection to a plurality of communications networks.

Objection to the Specification:

The Examiner objected to the amendment to the specification filed May 31, 2005 for adding new matter. Applicants note that the amendments to the specification were made to incorporate changes to the specification made during the international phase of the application. Thus, no new matter has been added. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore requested.

Information Disclosure Statement:

The Information Disclosure Statement filed May 31, 2005 has not been fully acknowledged because the Examiner asserts that the Information Disclosure Statement fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR §1.98(a)(2) with respect to the Bilgic reference. Applicants note that copies of references cited in an International Search Report are supplied by WIPO to the USPTO. Therefore, in accordance with U.S. practice, copies of references cited in the International Search Report do not have to be provided, as they should already be on file with the USPTO.

In the present case, Applicants have submitted a copy of the International Search Report issued in connection with the International Application on which the present U.S. continuation application is based. Further, pursuant to U.S. practice, the references cited in the International Search Report have been supplied by WIPO to the USPTO. Therefore, copies of the cited references in the International Search Report should already be on file with the USPTO. However, for the Examiner's convenience, and to expedite acknowledgement of the SB/08 form originally filed on May 31, 2005, Applicants submit herewith a copy of the SB/08 previously filed on May 31, 2005 along with a copy of the nonpatent literature document of Bilgic. Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge the Bilgic reference cited in the SB/08 form and return the acknowledged SB/08 form to Applicants.

Rejection Under 35 USC §112

Claims 9-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, on the ground that the specification, while being enabling for selection means in combination with other components, does not reasonably provide enablement for every possible selection means and their equivalents. In accordance with the Examiner's comments, Applicants have rewritten claim 9 so that 35 USC

§112, sixth paragraph, is not invoked. Thus, because claim 9 is not presented in means-plus-function format, 35 USC §112, paragraph 6, is not invoked and the claims are enabled under 35 USC §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 9-15 Recite Statutory Subject Matter

Claims 9-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §101 on the ground that the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter because the “selection means appear to be directed towards software alone, as it appears that the selection is performed by a program that is executed by a computer processor.” (Office Action at 4). To expedite prosecution of this application, claim 9 is amended to explicitly recite that the “selector is at least one of hardware and software executed by a computer processor.”

Thus, the selector is statutory subject matter and therefore, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-15 are also statutory subject matter. Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Prior Art Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claims 9-16 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by WO 02/01822 (“Lantto”).

The Present Disclosure:

Disclosed is a system for making a selection from a set of architectures dedicated to communication networks in a terminal adapted for simultaneous connection to a plurality of the communication networks. The system selects an architecture (15, 16, 17) dedicated to a plurality of communications networks (40, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52) in a terminal (10) including a user interface (11).¹

¹ These descriptive details are provided only for the convenience of the Examiner as part of the discussion presented herein, and are not intended to argue limitations that are not claimed. Further, this is not intended to argue any

The connection to one or more of the plurality of communications networks (40, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52) is set up by means of a PDP context link via a mobile network. The system controls access to a dedicated architecture manager (19) integrated into the terminal (10) to manage an architecture (15, 16, 17) dedicated to one of the plurality of communications networks (40, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52) and to simultaneously process the operation of the dedicated architectures (15, 16, 17) of the terminal (10) which is connected to the plural communications networks (40, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52). The system is used for selecting access to a plurality of communications networks (40, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52) each offering a set of services via a dedicated architecture (15, 16, 17) integrated into the terminal (10), which is connected to a public mobile network to which the user is a subscriber. Thus, the disclosed and claimed system provides the manner in which remote access with a plurality of networks is selected and managed in a terminal.

Claims 9-16 are not anticipated by Lantto.

Claims 9-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by WO 02/01822 (“Lantto”). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose every element of the claim, as arranged in the claim, and in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the anticipated subject matter. See, PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp., 75 F.3d 1558, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). A reference that does not expressly disclose all of the elements of a claimed invention cannot anticipate unless all of the undisclosed elements are inherently present in the reference. See, Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 942 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present

interpretation of any claim term that is narrower than would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the context of the specification and the claims as a whole.

case, Lantto fails to disclose the connection to a plurality of communications networks as disclosed and claimed in the present application. Therefore, claims 9-16 and new claim 17 are allowable.

Independent claim 9 explicitly recites

a selector integrated into the user interface of the terminal and configured to ...

manage a respective one of the set of architectures dedicated to each of said plural communications networks; and

connect the dedicated architecture manager via the PDP context link to each connected one of said plural communications networks to process a state of said link and to adapt a resource to the selected said plural communications networks.

Likewise, claim 16 recites:

controlling access to a dedicated architecture manager integrated into the terminal to manage a state of each of a plurality of dedicated architectures dedicated to selected ones of said plural communications networks; ...

processing a state of the PDP context link to the selected communications networks of said plural communications networks; and

accessing a resource of the terminal accessible by the dedicated architecture and adapted to the each selected communications network of said plural communications networks.

Lantto discloses a method and arrangement to achieve remote and secure access to a private data communications network. Specifically, Lantto discloses a remote and secure access login system for accessing a data communication network via a pseudo-connectionless technology ("PCT") device. Lantto's terminal is connected to the communication network with a Packet Data Protocol (PDP) context link and the terminal manages a unique secure VPN session to the PCT device. (Lantto at p. 8, ll. 11-22).

In Lantto, when a user of a computer wants to access a corporate network via a GPRS service using a Remote Access Login (RAL) system, the user launches the software for the RAL system. The user performs one single connect activity, e. g. a mouse click, which automatically

triggers the RAL system to define a PCT session Packet Data Protocol (PDP) context, comprising pseudo-connectionless characteristics of a PCT session. The defined session context is then passed to the PCT device, which triggers the set-up of a connection. The connection then triggers the establishment of a secure Virtual Private Network. It should be noted that there is only one PDP context for the single connection in Lantto. In Lantto, there is only one communication network disclosed and accordingly, only a single VPN session. Therefore, there is no need to “manage a respective one of the set of architectures dedicated to each of said plural communications networks” as recited in claim 9.

The pending claims each require a simultaneous connection to a plurality of communication networks. The Examiner fails to cite, and Applicant’s review of Lantto failed to discover, anywhere that Lantto teaches or suggests managing a set of dedicated architectures simultaneously connected to different communication networks. Lantto discloses a Remote Access Service (RAS) component to access a RAL system. (Lantto, p. 17, ll. 22-25). However, the disclosure of a single RAS component in Lantto does not anticipate Applicants’ claimed selection from a set of architectures dedicated to a plurality of simultaneously connected communications networks. Thus, for at least this reason, Lantto does not anticipate the recited subject matter of claim 9.

Further, as noted above, claim 9 recites processing by the selector to “connect the dedicated architecture manager via the PDP context link to each connected one of said plural communications networks to process a state of said link and to adapt a resource to the selected said plural communications networks.” A similar limitation is recited in method claim 16. The Examiner asserts that this limitation is disclosed in Lantto at page 10, lines 16-21; Applicants disagree with this assertion.

The cited portion of Lantto states that the flexible PDP context management enables usage scenarios such as obtaining GPRS service when roaming and easily changing Quality of Service (QoS) parameters when changing equipment or accessing another Internet Service Provider (ISP) than the default ISP. However, Lantto only addresses such items as QoS for a single communications network. Therefore, the requirement for managing a plurality of communications networks, as in Applicants' claims, is not present in Lantto.

In contrast, the present system and method relates to selecting and managing a plurality of connections to a plurality of communications networks. For example, claim 16 recites "processing a state of the PDP context link to the selected communications networks of said plural communications networks; and accessing a resource of the terminal accessible by the dedicated architecture and adapted to the each selected communications network of said plural communications networks." These steps are not required, and therefore not disclosed, in a system connected to a single communication network. As such, the pending claims are not anticipated by Lantto and are thus in condition for allowance.

Conclusion


Because the cited reference fails to disclose the claimed system and method for making a selection from a set of architectures dedicated to a plurality of communications networks in a terminal that is configured to be simultaneously connected to the plurality of plural communications networks, the pending claims are each in condition for allowance.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any such fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP



By _____
Lance J. Lieberman
Reg. No. 28,437
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: December 19, 2008